

RECEIVED

0105

SEP 05 2001

550688

21 MR. DARBY: Yeah, my name's Forrest Darby. I

22 was a test site worker, like a few other speakers here.

23 And I have got all sorts of notes here and I will just

24 jump around a little bit. I will try to keep them less

25 than five minutes. One thing that the last speaker

0106

1 said that I completely agree with is the people who are

2 against Yucca Mountain -- and they have great reasons

3 for being against it, you know, there's a lot of good

4 reasons -- if you heckle the speakers, you undercut

5 your case, because it just, it just doesn't work very

6 well for you. It's better to have both sides speak

7 without heckling, and you know, the truth will win out,

8 hopefully.

9 One little anecdote I wanted to talk about

10 was when I was working out there, we had the major

11 test, the underground tests, and a few days before

12 these tests, we would have the physicists from Los

13 Alamos and Lawrence Livermore Laboratory would come in.

14 They wouldn't come in during the six months that we set

15 up for the test. They'd just come in maybe three or

16 four days before the test. That was the only time that

550688

17 we got a chance to talk to these physicists. And Yucca
18 Mountain was just getting started at that time. And I
19 asked a couple of the physicists, I said, "What is more
20 environmentally damaging, the underground testing that
21 we're doing right now, or the encapsulated waste
22 they're talking about sending to Yucca Mountain?" And
23 he said, "Is that a trick question?" And I said, "No.
24 I'm serious." And he said, "Of course the underground
25 testing is more environmentally damaging." And yet we
0107

1 had, according to one speaker, I thought it was just
2 700 underground shots, but one of the speakers said we
3 had 828. And we went ahead and we pushed these for
4 many, many years. Everybody was -- you know, we didn't
5 want to close down that industry, because we had
6 tens -- we had actually over 10,000 workers out there
7 and they were drawing good wages so we didn't want to
8 shut that down.

9 But yet Yucca Mountain turns around with the
10 encapsulated waste, and we want to stop that, and maybe
11 we should. But it just seems like a real dichotomy to
12 me that we were all for nuclear testing for so many
13 years, now we're against the waste. I've worked on

550688

14 coal-fired powerhouses, nuclear powerhouses and so
15 forth. And I can tell you that nuclear is a lot
16 cleaner. As far as the pollution and so forth, global
17 warming, nuclear is a lot better for global warming, so
18 I mean, it doesn't cause global warming the same way
19 coal-fired and oil-fired powerhouses do. And so
20 there's some good things about it.

21 Right now, in Area 5 out there, I don't know
22 if they're still bringing in nuclear waste, but they
23 were bringing it in forever in Area 5 at the test site.
24 When one gentleman talked about how many thousand miles
25 they've run with these trucks, on nuclear waste, well,
0108

1 they're bringing it in to the test site, and they have
2 been for gosh, I don't know, 25 years.

3 Let's see, look at some other things here.

4 Oh, Mr. O'Donnell, Senator O'Donnell talked about
5 getting something for us accepting Yucca Mountain. I
6 really hope we do, because I believe it was about 8 or
7 9 years ago we were supposed to get like \$100 million a
8 year for accepting this stuff. So I think there's some
9 real positive things that can come out. We could ask
10 for an awful lot from the federal government, because I

11 think it's coming. Doesn't matter what happens in this

550688

12 hearing, I think this is coming. And I think we should

13 get something for it. That's all I have to say.

14 Thanks.